

FW: Interim Zoning/Urgency Ordinance for Cannabis

Board of Supervisors

Mon 8/22/2016 1:11 PM

To: BOS_Legislative Assistants <BOS_Legislative-Assistants@co.slo.ca.us>; cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
<cr_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>;

For your review.
This is a District 1 constituent.
Thank you.

Blake Fixler
Administrative Assistant III
Board of Supervisors
San Luis Obispo County
www.slocounty.ca.gov

Connect with us:
www.facebook.com/SLOCountyGov
www.twitter.com/SLO_CountyGov
www.linkedin.com/company/county-of-san-luis-obispo
www.youtube.com/user/slocountygov

From: Bronze Deer Farm [mailto:bronzedeerfarm@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 1:07 PM
To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsup@co.slo.ca.us>; Guy Savage <gsavage@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: Interim Zoning/Urgency Ordinance for Cannabis

Honorable Supervisors:

As tax paying citizens of SLO County we are infuriated with the Urgency Ordinance crafted by Staff for Cannabis Cultivation. We believe it is fraught with inaccuracies and misinformation; and facts that are presented in a way that mislead the reader. This skewed information is now circulating in newspapers, online articles, bulletins, and more ---resulting in character assassination of the cannabis community.

At the July 26th BOS meeting, Staff was tasked to “*bring back a draft urgency ordinance prohibiting new planting countywide; and ban cultivation in residential suburban zoning.....*”

But this Urgency Ordinance, as written, is nothing short of an intent to **ban** all cannabis cultivation in unincorporated SLO County and vilify those who cultivate it!

This is a crime!

Staff is being lauded for their many months of research on cannabis, and reviewing ordinances of other counties, wishing to be 'in line with our neighbors to the north.' They are regarded as ipso facto experts on whose knowledge you depend to present a fair ordinance, and instead they have handed you a "sign now and verify later" document with untenable restrictions. With your busy schedules, you may have had the weekend, at best, to wade through this document ---and your personal staff's recommendations-- - to decide what is reasonable. If Staff's intention was to present an ordinance that is overly restrictive with the belief that they will be directed to amend it, it's unconscionable.

Honorable Supervisors, we ask that you vote **against** this ordinance and send Staff back to the drawing board. They should be directed to **retract** the misinformation they wantonly presented ----disparaging the cannabis community, and present facts as they apply to SLO County.

Whether we agree with the subject or not, innuendo and misinformation should not be used to sway your vote, or public opinion. In this instance, **Staff should be working with the cannabis community, not against them, to make an ordinance that works for all.**

Thank you.
Mamakos Family

FW: Contact Us (response #3119) Marijuana Ordinance

Board of Supervisors

Mon 8/22/2016 1:12 PM

To: BOS_Legislative Assistants <BOS_Legislative-Assistants@co.slo.ca.us>; cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder
<cr_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>;

For your review.
This is a District 2 constituent.
Thank you.

Blake Fixler
Administrative Assistant III
Board of Supervisors
San Luis Obispo County
www.slocounty.ca.gov

Connect with us:

www.facebook.com/SLOCountyGov

www.twitter.com/SLO_CountyGov

www.linkedin.com/company/county-of-san-luis-obispo

www.youtube.com/user/slocountygov

-----Original Message-----

From: Internet Webmaster [<mailto:webmaster@co.slo.ca.us>]

Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 10:39 AM

To: Board of Supervisors <Boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>

Subject: Contact Us (response #3119)

Contact Us (response #3119)

Survey Information

Site: County of SLO

Page Title: Contact Us

URL: <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/bos/BOSContactUs.htm>

Submission Time/Date: 8/22/2016 10:38:09 AM

Survey Response

Name:

Doug Scheel

Telephone Number:

Agenda No. 23
Meeting Date: August 23, 2016
Presented By: Doug Scheel

Rcv'd prior to the meeting & posted on the web: August 22, 2016

8/22/2016

Email address:

j-j-j@sbcglobal.net

Comments or questions (8,192 characters max):

This is not a well crafted ordinance, nor is the timing appropriate. There are State and Federal laws in place that can be used for this problem.

I encourage you to not pass this ordinance; stop, take the time to craft a well thought out proper response.

Thank you.

Doug Scheel

FW: California Valley

Vicki Shelby

Mon 8/22/2016 2:31 PM

To: BOS_Legislative Assistants <BOS_Legislative-Assistants@co.slo.ca.us>; cr_board_clerk Clerk Recorder <cr_board_clerk@co.slo.ca.us>;

1 attachment (17 KB)

Letter to SLO Board of Supervisors, Cal Valley.docx;

Vicki M. (Shelby) Fogleman
Legislative Assistant for
First District Supervisor Frank R. Mecham

.....
[San Luis Obispo CA 93408](#)
.....

email: vshelby@co.slo.ca.us

"Thinking a smile all the time will keep your face youthful" - Frank G. Burgess
"Wrinkles should merely indicate where smiles have been" - Mark Twain

From: CLAY BARNETT [mailto:claybarnettrealtor@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 1:51 PM
To: Vicki Shelby <vshelby@co.slo.ca.us>
Subject: California Valley

Hi Vicki,

Thank you for your assistance. Please share with all of the supervisors. Hopefully this is ok as an attachment (Word doc), if not I can send another way.

Thanks,

Clay Barnett

Keller Williams Realty

Paso Robles, CA.93446
Lic # 01898729

To: Supervisors

8/22/2016

Greetings,

My name is Clay Barnett and I am a licensed Realtor working in San Luis Obispo County. There are several realtors from different brokerages who try to help buyers and sellers all around the county including California Valley. We try to help both buyers and sellers accomplish their goals and do so in a way that is fair to everyone. We love a win-win situation and we don't want to help create a negative situation in any community but we also feel compelled to represent our client's best interests and we feel the board may not be equally considering the needs of all the property owners in California Valley.

After recently seeing the presentation that was also presented to you concerning California Valley it has come to my attention that there are several discrepancies and misrepresentations contained in the slideshow narration that we received at the North County Board of Realtors office.

Other agents pointed out to me that when the presenter showed a picture of a well drilling rig and stated this was an illegal and unpermitted well being drilled, that he must have been mistaken as they recognized the equipment as belonging to a long time California Valley resident who will only drill permitted wells and who may take exception to being depicted as someone who would drill without a permit. This leads to casting suspicion on many other claims made by the presenter. Such as the Marijuana is being sold out of state, how does he know this? He claimed many of the lots have more than 99 plants per parcel. Those of us who go out there frequently have not noticed this and in fact the growers we have met are stating they desire to follow the law and do what is right. There were other claims made that seemed to be pure speculation.

Most of the new buyers are of Asian descent and are farmers, not drug dealers. This brings up another issue. I was told by some of the new residents that they feel there is discrimination due to their racial/ethnic background and have experienced verbal assaults from long time locals telling them "their kind" and "dark haired people" are not welcome. They are trying to buy lots that are not next to existing homes and that are near other growers to try and avoid problems. Most are older and have lived frugally and saved their money to be able to come to SLO county for the purpose of growing within the law. These are good people who want to follow the rules. Sometimes they don't know all the rules and need to be instructed in the local codes but they do have a desire to comply and some are making plans to build permanent structures and add septic systems and wells, etc.. It seems there are regulations in place that if enforced will solve many of the problems noted. There could also be changes in regulations to ensure the crops are

being sold to legitimate medical processors, etc.. Or maybe to grow plants with a low THC level or look into the possibilities.

There are also many land owners in the valley that have wanted to sell their property for a long time but the market has been too low for them to sell. Now with the higher demand prices have increased making it possible for these people to sell and many are doing so.

There are over 7,000 of these approximately 2.5 acre parcels in California Valley. Some people own multiple lots but most owners probably own single lots. These property owners have been paying taxes for many, many years. This includes a special road maintenance tax. Most of the roads to these owners' lots are not maintained, for the most part only the roads to occupied lots seem to be maintained so the local residents are receiving an advantage from the absentee owners who often receive no benefit from this tax.

One concern we have is with the urgency ordinance that is being considered. Many of the land owners live out of the area and likely have not been contacted about the upcoming changes that will affect their property values and restrict the use. Have you considered sending notices to the land owners so they can voice their concerns?

Also, it seems many of the concerns in the ordinance have to do with land use in general and not just the marijuana growers. Some of the absentee landowners have drilled wells but are not currently pumping water. Most do not have wells. Is there a plan in place if the several thousand absentee owners decided to move to California Valley and drill wells and live on the property? Or rent it out? And if they are in an area where the well water is not good will they also be able to draw water from the community well? Or is that reserved for the people who have been there the longest? Water consumption will be a problem for almost any use in California Valley. Will you also ban other crops? Gardens? Livestock? All new development?

Another concern is for people who are currently in escrow or who just closed escrow on these lots. They bought the property based on current laws and regulations and this ordinance will change everything immediately after purchase and this seems unfair to buyers who just closed escrow and sellers who may be affected if escrows get cancelled. Perhaps the ordinance could exempt those in escrow or whose escrows close before a certain date so full disclosures can be made to buyers and sellers and property owners?

Thank you for your consideration,

Clay Barnett